

Patent
Atty. Dkt. No. A2584Q-US-NP
XERZ 2 01843

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE	Title: COLOR SATURATION ADJUSTMENT	
	First Named Inventor:	Meng Yao
	Application No.:	10/620,047
	Filing Date:	July 14, 2003
	Confirmation No.	7659
	Examiner:	Negussie Worku
Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	Art Unit:	2625
	Notice of Allowance:	July 31, 2008

Dear Sir:

Applicant has received the Interview Summary issued by the Examiner on September 26, 2008, in the above-identified patent application, and the present paper is responsive thereto.

Applicant confirms that a telephone interview, which was initiated by the Applicant, was conducted with the undersigned on September 24, 2008. During the telephone interview, the drawings filed on July 14, 2003 were discussed. Specifically, Examiner Worku indicated these drawings as being accepted.

With regard to the Notice of Allowance mailed July 31, 2008, Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication as to the allowance of the present application.

However, Applicant respectfully submits the Statements of Reasons for Allowance are, in and of themselves, inappropriate. It is noted that the reasons for allowance may be set forth in instances in which ". . . the Examiner believes that the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a claim or claims." (37 CFR §1.104(e)(2004)). In the present case, Applicant believes the record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear and, therefore, no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. Furthermore, the Applicant does not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance.

Specifically, it has been indicated that the claims are allowed by importing interpretations into the claims in relation to the prior art that results in a potential imprecise and/or inaccurate understanding of the reasons. This places an unwarranted

interpretation upon the claims. Such a characterization of the claims does not properly take into account applicant's claimed invention as reflected in the specification and the Applicant's responses to the Examiner's office actions.

Therefore, while applicant believes the claims are allowable, applicant does not acquiesce that patentability resides in only the features, exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability.

Respectfully submitted,

Fay Sharpe LLP

10/13/2008

Date

Jeffrey N. Zahn

Jeffrey N. Zahn, Reg. No. 54,864
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
216-861-5582

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any item referred to herein as being attached or enclosed) is (are) being transmitted to the USPTO by electronic transmission via the EFS Web on the date indicated below.

10-13-2008

Date

Christie L. Cermak

Name: Christie L. Cermak